

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,705 to Yonemitsu et al. ("Yonemitsu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,010 to Kurano et al. ("Kurano").

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 are objected to because of informalities.

Claims 5, 6, 8 and 9 are objected to because of alleged insufficient antecedent basis.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6, and 9.

Applicant has canceled claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 9 are pending.

The Objections to the Claims

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 5, 6, 8 and 9 are objected to because of alleged insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 6 and 9 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions at paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 6 and 9 is respectfully requested. Claims 5, 7, 8 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the objections to claims 5, 6, 8 and 10 moot.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,705 to Yonemitsu et al. ("Yonemitsu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,010 to Kurano et al. ("Kurano"). Claim 1 recites a recording medium reproduction apparatus for reproducing a recording medium in which recorded data and recording medium side reproduction restriction information is recorded. The recording medium side reproduction restriction information is a region code. The apparatus includes apparatus side reproduction restriction information. The apparatus includes control means which outputs and displays the recording medium side reproduction restriction information when reproduction is stopped based on a comparison of the apparatus side reproduction restriction information with the recording medium side reproduction restriction information. Therefore, a user can understand at a glance the reason why reproduction is stopped. A user will know that the reproduction apparatus is not the reason why reproduction is stopped, and that reproduction is stopped because the recording medium includes a region code that is not compatible with the reproduction apparatus. Moreover, a user will know at a glance the specific region code of the recording medium, and not merely that reproduction is stopped because of a region code incompatibility. The user's understanding at a glance can be very convenient, for example, when there is no description relating to the recording medium side reproduction restriction information on the recording medium or the package of the recording medium. Support for these features is provided at, for example, paragraphs 0034 and 0042 of Applicant's specification as originally filed.

In contrast, as described at col. 6, ll. 48-63, of Yonemitsu, the control circuit 34 reads the control code (disc territory code) and the inner territory code. The control circuit 34 compares

the disc territory code to the inner territory code and allows the encoded data to be outputted from the demultiplexer 32 to the decoder 33 if the disc territory code includes the inner territory code. If the disc territory code does not include the inner territory code, the control unit 34 does not allow the encoded data to be outputted from the demultiplexer 32 to the decoder 33. Thus, the apparatus of Yonemitsu merely allows or does not allow data to be outputted based on a comparison of a disc territory code and an inner territory code. It is submitted that Yonemitsu does not show at least the feature of control means which outputs and displays the recording medium side reproduction restriction information as a region code, when reproduction is stopped, as recited in claim 1.

Applicant submits that Kurano fails to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Yonemitsu. Kurano is directed to parental control of a video program recorded on an optical disk, being checked by a disk player even if a laser beam tracing jumps due to shocks or vibrations. (*See Abstract*). As described at col. 23, ll. 18-22, and illustrated in Fig. 1, if it is determined that a given sequence of the disk is to be subjected to reproduction restriction, the sequence is not reproduced, and characters indicating that parental control is being performed are displayed on monitor section 6. Displaying characters on the monitor indicating that parental control is being performed is not displaying reproduction restriction information that is contained on the optical disk. By merely showing characters indicating that parental control is being performed, a user only knows that parental control is being performed, and does not know any additional information, such as information that is contained on the optical disk in the form of reproduction restriction information. Therefore, Applicant submits that Kurano does not show at least the features of control means which outputs and displays the recording medium side

reproduction restriction information as a region code, when reproduction is stopped, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 3 recites a recording medium reproduction apparatus for reproducing a recording medium in which recorded data and recording medium side reproduction restriction information is recorded. The recording medium side reproduction restriction information is a region code. The apparatus includes apparatus side reproduction restriction information. The apparatus includes a control member which outputs and displays the recording medium side reproduction restriction information when reproduction is stopped based on a comparison of the apparatus side reproduction restriction information with the recording medium side reproduction restriction information. For the reasons described above, it is submitted that neither Yonemitsu nor Kurano shows the feature of a control member which outputs and displays the recording medium side reproduction restriction information as a region code, when reproduction is stopped, as recited in claim 3. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 3 is patentable as well.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, and claim 9 depends from claim 3. The dependent claims recite the same combination of allowable features recited in the independent claims, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), of claims 1, 3, 6 and 9 be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: May 27, 2004

By: 

Peter J. Sistare

Registration No. 48,183

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202.739.3000